UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,406	11/03/2000	James P. Tagg	TAG P-3	7866
STEPHEN M.	7590 12/19/2007 CHIN	1	ЕХАМ	INER
REED SMITH LLP			BLAIR, DOUGLAS B	
599 LEXINGT 29th FLOOR	ON AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10022			2142	
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			_ <i>H</i> /\
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/706,406	TAGG, JAMES P.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas B. Blair	2142	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESULTING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be a served patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03	3 July 2007.		•
,— .	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-47</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>21-47</u> are subject to restriction and	I/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cord 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
11) I he oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action of John 170-102.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		N. Parkan Na	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a		received.	
See the attached detailed office determined	not of the continue copies i.e		
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

09/706,406 Art Unit: 2142

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 21-45, drawn to a method of providing software to a client system and using the software to connect to a target network via a host system, classified in class 709, subclass 203.
- II. Claim 46, drawn to a system comprising a host system, a client system and matching means for establishing a connection with a target network via the client when host and client system requirements match and via the host when the requirements do not match, classified in class 709, subclass 227.
- III. Claim 47, drawn to a cooperative networking system comprising a cooperative agent capable of examining membership information and a matching means that creates a tunnel controlled by the host system, classified in class 709, subclass 223.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as the matching means claimed as part of claim 46 is not required to perform the connection claimed in claim 21. Also claim 46 does not require software that controls a host system to be provided to a client as claim 21 does. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions I and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination III has separate utility such as a cooperative agent which examines membership information. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination III has separate utility such as a cooperative agent which examines membership information and a matching means which performs differing functionality than that of Invention II. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the

Application/Control Number:

09/706,406

Art Unit: 2142

inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is (571) 272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

09/706,406

Art Unit: 2142

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Douglas Blair Douglas Blair